

ON THE WEYL CURVATURE HYPOTHESIS

CRISTI STOICA

ABSTRACT. The Weyl curvature hypothesis of Penrose attempts to explain the high homogeneity and isotropy, and the very low entropy of the early universe, by conjecturing the vanishing of the Weyl tensor at the Big Bang singularity.

In previous papers it has been proposed an equivalent form of Einstein's equation, which extends it and remains valid at an important class of singularities (including in particular the Schwarzschild, FLRW, and isotropic singularities). Here it is shown that if the Big Bang singularity is from this class, it also satisfies the Weyl curvature hypothesis.

As an application, we study a very general example of cosmological model, which generalizes the FLRW model by dropping the isotropy and homogeneity constraints. This model generalizes both the FLRW model and the isotropic singularities. We show that the Big-Bang singularity of this model is of the type under consideration, and satisfies therefore the Weyl curvature hypothesis.

CONTENTS

Introduction	1
0.1. The Weyl curvature hypothesis	1
0.2. Semi-regular spacetimes	3
0.3. Expanded Einstein equation and quasi-regular spacetimes	4
1. The Weyl curvature vanishes at quasi-regular singularities	5
2. Example: a general, non-isotropic and inhomogeneous cosmological model	6
3. Conclusion	9
Acknowledgements	9
References	9

INTRODUCTION

0.1. The Weyl curvature hypothesis. In searching an explanation of the second law of Thermodynamics, and of the high homogeneity and isotropy of the universe, especially around the Big Bang, Roger Penrose arrived at the *Weyl curvature hypothesis* (WCH) [1].

His physical motivation was the search for an explanation of the *arrow of time* – the second law, formulated as the *law of increasing entropy*. As it is known, Boltzmann's explanation relies on the atomic structure of matter, in the framework of Newtonian mechanics. But the fundamental evolution equations in Newtonian mechanics are symmetric in time, in the sense that reversing the time in the equations leads to equally valid equations, with equally valid solutions. This explanation works also in the context of modern physics, because we don't know of fundamental laws which are not invariant at time reversal (or at least at the simultaneous CPT transformation).

In terms of the coarse grained phase space, the entropy is proportional to the logarithm of the volume of the system. Systems at thermal equilibrium occupy the largest volume in phase

Date: March 12, 2012.

space. Any state tends to evolve towards the most probable state, which is of highest entropy. The observations that entropy currently increases show that it was lower in the past, and that it was in fact more and more lower as one approaches the beginning of the Universe.

Penrose's analysis lead him to the conclusion that the initial conditions of the Universe had to be restricted to a very small region of the phase space: of about $\frac{1}{10^{10^{123}}}$ (for comparison, the number of particles in the visible universe is of just 10^{90}). His analysis of the flow of energy in the Universe led him to the idea that the second law of Thermodynamics is due to very high homogeneity around the Big-Bang. Penrose explains this homogeneity by the following argument ([1], p. 614):

In terms of spacetime curvature, the absence of clumping corresponds, very roughly, to the absence of Weyl conformal curvature (since absence of clumping implies spatial-isotropy, and hence no gravitational principal null-directions).

He further added "this restriction on the early geometry should be something like: the Weyl curvature C_{abcd} vanishes at any initial singularity" ([1], p. 630).

The Weyl tensor C_{abcd} is the traceless part of the Riemann curvature tensor R_{abcd} . From gravitational viewpoint, it is responsible for the tidal forces. The tensor $C_{abc}{}^d$ is invariant at conformal rescalings $g_{ab} \mapsto \Omega^2 g_{ab}$. If it vanishes, it indicates that the metric is conformally flat (in dimension ≥ 4 ; in lower dimension it vanishes trivially).

In addition to Penrose's motivations for the WCH, other reasons come from Quantum Gravity. We expect that, near the Big-Bang, the quantum effects of gravity take over, but we know that gravity is perturbatively nonrenormalizable at two loops [2, 3]. A vanishing Weyl tensor would mean a vanishing of local degrees of freedom, hence of gravitons, and this would remove some of the problems [4].

An important type of singularities which automatically satisfy a version of the WCH (stating that the Weyl curvature remains finite at singularity) are the *isotropic singularities*. They were researched by Tod [5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10], Claudel & Newman [11], Anguige & Tod [12, 13]. The metric tensor in this case can be obtained by a conformal rescaling from a regular (*i.e.* non-singular) metric tensor, and presents nice behavior from conformal geometric viewpoint. Because the Weyl tensor $C_{abc}{}^d$ is invariant at conformal rescalings, the main feature of the isotropic singularities is that the Weyl tensor equals that of a regular metric, hence remaining finite. If we apply a conformal rescaling to a metric tensor g_{ab} , the new metric $\hat{g}_{ab} := \Omega^2 g_{ab}$ has the Weyl curvature tensor $\hat{C}_{abc}{}^d = C_{abc}{}^d$, which is smooth, but not necessarily vanishing at $\Omega = 0$. But $\hat{C}_{abcd}$ vanishes, since

$$(1) \quad \hat{C}_{abcd} = \hat{g}_{sd} \hat{C}_{abc}{}^s = \Omega^2 g_{sd} C_{abc}{}^s = 0.$$

A simple example of vanishing Weyl tensor is provided by the Friedmann-Lemaître-Robertson-Walker (FLRW) cosmological model. This model implements the *cosmological principle* that the Universe is, at very large scales, homogeneous and isotropic. But it is irrelevant for the WCH, because it is too symmetric, and its Weyl tensor vanishes identically.

In this paper we will prove that a much larger class of singularities, which includes among others the isotropic singularities, satisfies the Weyl curvature hypothesis. This larger class is not a random generalization of the isotropic singularities, but it appeared from our research on a different problem. Previous considerations led us to the idea that, for a singularity to be still manageable from mathematical viewpoint, some conditions are in order [14, 15]. These conditions allowed the definition of the Riemann curvature R_{abcd} (but not of $R_{abc}{}^d$). This program successfully led to a better understanding of the black hole singularities (see *e.g.* [16]).

Further considerations suggested that the Ricci decomposition of the curvature tensor should be smooth, in order to allow the writing of an equation which extends Einstein's at a large class of singularities, but is equivalent to it for non-degenerate metrics [17]. These singularities behave, mathematically, as if the metric loses one or more dimensions, and consequently as if the cotangent space loses one or more dimensions. They have, as a bonus, the property that C_{abcd} vanishes, as we will prove in §1. The proof is largely based on the idea that $C_{abcd} = 0$ in lower dimensions.

As an application, in §2 we will study a very general cosmological model, which does not assume, like the FLRW model, that the space slices have the metric constant in time, up to an overall scaling factor $a(t)$ which depends on the time only and which vanishes at the Big-Bang. In our model we will keep the overall scaling factor $a(t)$, but we will allow the space part of the metric to change in time freely. The physical motivation is that in the actual Universe there is no perfect isotropy and homogeneity, and in fact at smaller scales the inhomogeneity is important. Working in such general settings, we will not be concerned at this time with the matter content of this universe. Because the solution is very general, the possibilities of matter fields which can give this kind of metric are limitless. This metric has non-vanishing Weyl tensor in general, but we will show that at the Big-Bang singularities C_{abcd} vanishes.

0.2. Semi-regular spacetimes. We were initially interested in the general study of metrics which can become degenerate or change their signature [14, 15, 18]. We arrived at a large class of metrics with singularities, for which the Riemann curvature tensor R_{abcd} can be defined and remains smooth. The main obstruction is, of course, the fact that when the metric $g_{ab} \rightarrow 0$, its reciprocal $g^{ab} \rightarrow \infty$. This prevents standard tensor operations like index raising, and the contraction between covariant indices. Consequently, we can't define the Levi-Civita connection and its curvature. But in [14] we found a large class of singular semi-Riemannian manifolds on which we can define covariant contraction, and eventually construct directly the Riemann curvature tensor R_{abcd} , which turns out to be smooth. To do this, we avoided working with $\nabla_X Y$, which can't be defined, and used instead as much as possible the *Koszul form*, defined as:

$$(2) \quad \mathcal{K}(X, Y, Z) := \frac{1}{2} \{X\langle Y, Z \rangle + Y\langle Z, X \rangle - Z\langle X, Y \rangle - \langle X, [Y, Z] \rangle + \langle Y, [Z, X] \rangle + \langle Z, [X, Y] \rangle\}$$

which helps, for a non-degenerate metric, defining the Levi-Civita connection implicitly by

$$(3) \quad \langle \nabla_X Y, Z \rangle = \mathcal{K}(X, Y, Z).$$

When the metric becomes degenerate we can't construct the Levi-Civita connection.

In [14] we define the Riemann curvature R_{abcd} even for non-degenerate metrics, in a way which avoids the undefined $\nabla_X Y$, but relies on the defined and smooth $\mathcal{K}(X, Y, Z)$.

To be able to define the Riemann curvature in terms of the Koszul form only, the differential 1-form $\mathcal{K}(X, Y, \cdot)$ has to admit covariant derivative, which has to be smooth. This is equivalent to requiring that

- (1) $\mathcal{K}(X, Y, W) = 0$ whenever W satisfies $\langle W, X \rangle = 0$ for any X
- (2) the contraction $\mathcal{K}(X, Y, \bullet)\mathcal{K}(Z, T, \bullet)$ is smooth for any local vector fields X, Y, Z, T .

A *semi-regular manifold* is defined as a singular semi-Riemannian manifold satisfying the above conditions. Its metric is called *semi-regular metric*. A *semi-regular spacetime* is a 4-dimensional semi-regular manifold M with metric g which is non-degenerate on a dense subset of M , and which has the signature at each point (r, s, t) , $s \leq 3$, $t \leq 1$ [14].

We defined the Riemann curvature R_{abcd} by

$$(4) \quad R_{abcd} = \partial_a \Gamma_{bcd} - \partial_b \Gamma_{acd} + \Gamma_{ac\bullet} \Gamma_{bd\bullet} - \Gamma_{bc\bullet} \Gamma_{ad\bullet}$$

where $\Gamma_{abc} = \mathcal{K}(\partial_a, \partial_b, \partial_c)$ are the Christoffel's symbols of the first kind. This is smooth for semi-regular manifolds.

It is easy to see that from the smoothness of R_{abcd} follows the smoothness of the Einstein tensor density $G_{ab} \det g$, leading to the possibility of writing a densitized version of Einstein's equation, which remains smooth at semi-regular singularities [14].

But there is another way to write an equivalent form of Einstein's equation, which we introduced in [19, 17]. It leads to an *expanded Einstein equation*, obtained from Einstein's equation by taking the Kulkarni-Nomizu product (section §0.3, eqn. (10)). This leads to a special class of semi-regular spacetimes, named quasi-regular spacetimes, which allow the formulation of the expanded Einstein equation. As it turned out, important classes of singularities are quasi-regular: the isotropic singularities, the Schwarzschild singularity, $1 + 3$ degenerate warped products, in particular the FLRW Big Bang singularity. As we will see, the quasiregular singularities satisfy the WCH.

0.3. Expanded Einstein equation and quasi-regular spacetimes. The standard Einstein equation is

$$(5) \quad G_{ab} + \Lambda g_{ab} = \kappa T_{ab}$$

where Λ is the *cosmological constant*, and $\kappa := \frac{8\pi\mathcal{G}}{c^4}$, $\mathcal{G}$ and c being the gravitational constant and the speed of light. By

$$(6) \quad G_{ab} := R_{ab} - \frac{1}{2}Rg_{ab},$$

we denoted the Einstein tensor, obtained from the *Ricci curvature* $R_{ab} := g^{st}R_{asbt}$ and the *scalar curvature* $R := g^{st}R_{st}$. Einstein's equation (5) makes sense so long as the metric is not singular.

One situation when the metric becomes singular is by becoming degenerate – *i.e.* its determinant becomes 0. Then, the inverse g^{ab} can't be constructed, and Einstein's equation can no longer be written.

In [19, 17] we introduced a new version of Einstein's equation, called *the expanded Einstein equation*:

$$(7) \quad (G \circ g)_{abcd} + \Lambda(g \circ g)_{abcd} = \kappa(T \circ g)_{abcd}$$

The new equation is equivalent to the standard Einstein equation so long as the metric is not singular, but it can be written, and remains smooth, even in cases when the metric becomes degenerate. The reason is that the expanded equation contains additional factors g_{ab} which cancel the singularities and the Kulkarni-Nomizu product $G \circ g$ remains smooth.

The tensor S_{abcd} is the scalar part of the Riemann curvature, and E_{abcd} the *semi-traceless part* of the Riemann curvature. They are defined (see *e.g.* [20, 21, 22]) by:

$$(8) \quad S_{abcd} = \frac{1}{n(n-1)}R(g \circ g)_{abcd},$$

$$(9) \quad E_{abcd} = \frac{1}{n-2}(S \circ g)_{abcd},$$

where

$$(10) \quad (h \circ k)_{abcd} := h_{ac}k_{bd} - h_{ad}k_{bc} + h_{bd}k_{ac} - h_{bc}k_{ad}$$

denotes the *Kulkarni-Nomizu product* of two symmetric bilinear forms h and k , and

$$(11) \quad S_{ab} := R_{ab} - \frac{1}{n}Rg_{ab}.$$

The *Weyl curvature tensor* is defined by

$$(12) \quad C_{abcd} = R_{abcd} - S_{abcd} - E_{abcd}.$$

The expanded Einstein equation can be rewritten in terms of E_{abcd} and S_{abcd} :

$$(13) \quad 2E_{abcd} - 3S_{abcd} + \Lambda(g \circ g)_{abcd} = \kappa(T \circ g)_{abcd}.$$

In [19, 17] we saw that our version of Einstein's equation remains smooth at the FLRW Big-Bang singularity, isotropic singularities, 1 + 3 warped products with degenerate warping function, and at the Schwarzschild black hole singularity.

This motivated the introduction of quasi-regular spacetimes in [17]:

Definition 0.1. We say that a semi-regular manifold (M, g_{ab}) is *quasi-regular*, and that g_{ab} is a *quasi-regular metric*, if:

- (1) g_{ab} is non-degenerate on a subset $M_0 \subset M$ dense in M (so that $\overline{M_0} = M$)
- (2) the tensors S_{abcd} and E_{abcd} defined at the points $p \in M_0$ where the metric is non-degenerate extend smoothly to the entire manifold M .

If a semi-regular spacetime is also a quasi-regular manifold, we call it *quasi-regular spacetime*.

From mathematical viewpoint, the condition that $\overline{M_0} = M$ is required to allow the extension by continuity of the tensors S_{abcd} and E_{abcd} at the points where the metric is non-degenerate. From physical viewpoint this condition is not limiting, because we don't expect the metric to be degenerate on four-dimensional volumes. We don't know of examples (even in theory) of a metric which is degenerate on a four-dimensional volume, and in fact, such a degeneracy would extend to the entire spacetime, because of the field equations.

The central result of this paper is that the quasi-regular singularities satisfy the Weyl curvature hypothesis.

1. THE WEYL CURVATURE VANISHES AT QUASI-REGULAR SINGULARITIES

Theorem 1.1. The Weyl curvature tensor C_{abcd} vanishes at quasi-regular singularities.

Proof. From the smoothness of R_{abcd} , E_{abcd} , S_{abcd} , and from equation (12), follows the smoothness of C_{abcd} .

The following considerations use objects described in detail in [14], but we try to make the proof as self-contained as possible. Since the metric g is a bilinear form on the tangent vector space $T_p M$, it defines, at the points p where it is degenerate, the totally degenerate space $T_{\circ p} M := T_p M^\perp$, named the *radical* of $T_p M$. We construct its annihilator

$$(14) \quad T^\bullet_p M := \{\omega \in T_p^* M; \omega|_{T_{\circ p} M} = 0\},$$

named the *radical annihilator*. The radical annihilator is the image of the index lowering morphism $\flat : T_p M \rightarrow T_p^* M$, $X^\flat(Y) := \langle X, Y \rangle$, $\forall X, Y \in T_p M$:

$$(15) \quad T^\bullet_p M = \text{im } \flat \leq T_p^* M.$$

The dual of the radical annihilator, $(T^\bullet_p M)^*$, is isomorphic with the quotient $T_p M / T_{\circ p} M$. On $T^\bullet_p M$, g induces a canonical non-degenerate metric defined by

$$(16) \quad g_\bullet(\omega, \tau) := \langle X, Y \rangle$$

where $X^\flat = \omega$ and $Y^\flat = \tau$. This metric is used for covariant contractions, so long as the contracted tensor components live in $T^\bullet_p M$.

As it is shown in [14], the Riemann curvature tensor R_{abcd} of a semi-regular semi-Riemannian manifold satisfies at each $p \in M$

$$(17) \quad (R_{abcd})_p \in T^\bullet_p M \otimes T^\bullet_p M \otimes T^\bullet_p M \otimes T^\bullet_p M.$$

At the points p where the metric g is degenerate, $\dim(T_p^\bullet M) < 4$. Since in dimension ≤ 3 any tensor having the symmetries of the Weyl tensor vanishes (see *e.g.* [21]), it follows that

$$(18) \quad (C_{abcd})_p = 0$$

whenever g is degenerate at p . This concludes the proof. $\square$

2. EXAMPLE: A GENERAL, NON-ISOTROPIC AND INHOMOGENEOUS COSMOLOGICAL MODEL

The FLRW model is very good for very large scales, where we can completely ignore any inhomogeneity and anisotropy in the distribution of matter. But in reality the universe is not homogeneous at all scales. This is why we are motivated in studying a spacetime (M, g) which is allowed to be inhomogeneous and anisotropic. We assume that there is a global time $\tau : M \rightarrow I$ where $I \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ is an interval. We also assume that the topology of the space slices $\Sigma_t := \tau^{-1}(t)$ is independent on the time $t \in I$, being thus all of them diffeomorphic with a three-dimensional manifold Σ . Each manifold Σ_t is endowed with a metric tensor of the form

$$(19) \quad g_{ij}(t) := a(t)h_{ij}(t),$$

where $1 \leq i, j \leq 3$, $h(t)$ is a Riemannian (non-degenerate) metric on Σ_t , also represented as arc element by $d\sigma_t$. We require $a(t)$ and $h_{ij}(t)$ to depend smoothly on $t \in I$. While $h(t)$ is Riemannian (and non-degenerate) for any $t \in I$, $a(t)$ is allowed to vanish. The Big-Bang is therefore obtained for $a(t) = 0$.

Therefore we see that it is natural to consider that the spacetime is $M = I \times \Sigma$, with the following metric:

$$(20) \quad ds^2 = -dt^2 + a^2(t)d\sigma_t^2.$$

If we take $h_{ij}(t)$ to be independent on time, and of constant curvature, we obtain the FLRW model (which is not interesting from this viewpoint, because in this case $C_{abcd} = 0$ trivially, for all times t). But if we allow $d\sigma_t^2$ to depend freely on time, the solution is much more general. The Big Bang singularity obtained when $a(t) = 0$ is much more general than the FLRW Big Bang singularity, because we allow the geometry of space slices $(\Sigma_t, h(t))$ to be inhomogeneous and to vary with time.

We will actually prefer to be a bit more general and allow the metric on I to become degenerate too:

$$(21) \quad ds^2 = -N^2(t)dt^2 + a^2(t)d\sigma_t^2,$$

where $N : I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a smooth function. If $N(t) \neq 0$ for any $t \in I$, then a reparametrization of I allows the metric to be of the form (20), so this generalization is important only when $N(t)$ vanishes together with $a(t)$. For reasons which will become apparent, we will require that

$$(22) \quad f(t) := \frac{a(t)}{N(t)}$$

is not singular. For example, if $f(t) = 1$ (hence $N(t) = a(t)$), the resulting singularities are just isotropic singularities, as those studied by Tod & *al.* But allowing $f(t)$ to vanish together with $a(t)$ leads to more general, anisotropic singularities.

We are here interested in the most general case.

Theorem 2.1. The metric (21) is quasi-regular.

Proof. The plan is to prove that the metric is semi-regular, by showing that the terms in the Riemann curvature tensor (4) are smooth. Then we show that the Ricci decomposition

$$(23) \quad R_{abcd} = E_{abcd} + S_{abcd} + C_{abcd}.$$

is smooth.

The metric components are:

$$(24) \quad g(t, x) = \begin{pmatrix} g_{00} & g_{0i} \\ g_{j0} & g_{ij} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -N^2(t) & 0 \\ 0 & a^2(t)h_{ij}(t, x) \end{pmatrix}$$

The reciprocal metric components are:

$$(25) \quad g^{-1}(t, x) = \begin{pmatrix} g^{00} & g^{0i} \\ g^{j0} & g^{ij} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -N^{-2}(t) & 0 \\ 0 & a^{-2}(t)h^{ij}(t, x) \end{pmatrix}$$

The partial derivatives of the metric tensor are therefore:

$$(26) \quad \begin{aligned} g_{00,0} &= -2N\dot{N} \\ g_{00,k} &= 0 \\ g_{ij,0} &= a(2\dot{a}h_{ij} + a\dot{h}_{ij}) \\ g_{ij,k} &= a^2\partial_k h_{ij} \end{aligned}$$

The second order partial derivatives of the metric tensor are:

$$(27) \quad \begin{aligned} g_{00,00} &= -2(\dot{N}^2 + N\ddot{N}) \\ g_{00,k0} &= g_{00,0k} = g_{00,kl} = 0 \\ g_{ij,00} &= 2\dot{a}^2 h_{ij} + 2a\ddot{a}h_{ij} + 4a\dot{a}\dot{h}_{ij} + a^2\ddot{h}_{ij} \\ g_{ij,k0} &= a(2\dot{a}\partial_k h_{ij} + a\partial_k \dot{h}_{ij}) \\ g_{ij,kl} &= a^2\partial_k \partial_l h_{ij} \end{aligned}$$

To check that g is semi-regular, it is enough to check that the terms of the form $g_{ab,\bullet}g_{cd,\bullet}$ are smooth. By using the equations (26) we find that

$$(28) \quad \begin{aligned} g_{00,\bullet}g_{00,\bullet} &= -N^{-2}g_{00,0}g_{00,0} + a^{-2}h^{cd}g_{00,c}g_{00,d} \\ &= -4\dot{N}^2 \end{aligned}$$

$$(29) \quad \begin{aligned} g_{00,\bullet}g_{ij,\bullet} &= -N^{-2}g_{00,0}g_{ij,0} + a^{-2}h^{cd}g_{00,c}g_{ij,d} \\ &= 2\frac{\dot{N}a}{N}(2\dot{a}h_{ij} + a\dot{h}_{ij}) \end{aligned}$$

$$(30) \quad \begin{aligned} g_{ij,\bullet}g_{kl,\bullet} &= -N^{-2}g_{ij,0}g_{kl,0} + a^{-2}h^{cd}g_{ij,c}g_{kl,d} \\ &= -\frac{a^2}{N^2}(2\dot{a}h_{ij} + a\dot{h}_{ij})(2\dot{a}h_{kl} + a\dot{h}_{kl}) + a^2h^{cd}\partial_c h_{ij}\partial_d h_{kl} \end{aligned}$$

But since for a smooth function $f(t, x)$

$$(31) \quad a(t, x) = f(t, x)N(t),$$

the terms calculated above become now manifestly smooth:

$$(32) \quad \begin{aligned} g_{00,\bullet}g_{00,\bullet} &= -4\dot{N}^2 \\ g_{00,\bullet}g_{ij,\bullet} &= 2\dot{N}f(2\dot{a}h_{ij} + a\dot{h}_{ij}) \\ g_{ij,\bullet}g_{kl,\bullet} &= -f^2(2\dot{a}h_{ij} + a\dot{h}_{ij})(2\dot{a}h_{kl} + a\dot{h}_{kl}) + a^2h^{cd}\partial_c h_{ij}\partial_d h_{kl} \end{aligned}$$

Therefore the metric g is semi-regular.

We are now interested in proving that $\text{Ric} \circ g$ and $Rg \circ g$ are smooth. For this, we have to contract the terms from (27) and (32), and see what happens when taking Kulkarni-Nomizu products with g . If we apply a contraction, to calculate the Ricci tensor, each of these terms will

get an additional factor of N^{-2} or $a^{-2} = f^{-2}N^{-2}$, which we hope will be canceled by the terms N^2 and a^2 introduced by the Kulkarni-Nomizu products with g .

So let's analyze each of the terms from (27) and (32). We are not interested in the terms $g_{00,k0}$, $g_{00,0k}$, and $g_{00,kl}$, because they vanish.

The term $g_{00,00}$ can be contracted only by g^{00} . One such contraction, needed to get the Ricci tensor, introduces the factor N^{-2} , which is canceled by taking the Kulkarni-Nomizu product with the metric g , which introduces the counterfactor N^2 (since it introduces $a^2 = f^2N^2$). Similarly, two contractions, needed to obtain the curvature scalar, introduce the factor N^{-4} , canceled by the factor N^4 contained in $g \circ g$. Similar reasoning leads to the conclusion that the terms obtained from $g_{00,\bullet}g_{00,\bullet}$ are smooth too.

For the terms of the form $g_{ij,kl}$, or those of the form $g_{ij,\bullet}g_{kl,\bullet}$, we have the following situation. Luckily, $g_{ij,kl}$ already contains the factor a^2 , while

$$(33) \quad g_{ij,\bullet}g_{kl,\bullet} = f^2 \left(-(2\dot{a}h_{ij} + a\dot{h}_{ij})(2\dot{a}h_{kl} + a\dot{h}_{kl}) + N^2 h^{cd} \partial_c h_{ij} \partial_d h_{kl} \right)$$

already contains the factor f^2 . A first contraction will introduce $a^{-2} = f^{-2}N^{-2}$, but f^2 was already present in the initial term. Multiplying with g_{00} introduces the counterfactor N^2 , which is enough to cancel the remaining factor N^{-2} . Noticing that $g \circ g$ contains g_{00} at most once in a given term, we conclude that the factors introduced by the second contraction are also canceled by taking the Kulkarni-Nomizu product.

When contracting the terms of the form $g_{ij,00}$, the contractions introduce the factors $a^{-2}N^{-2}$. Since a term of $g \circ g$ contains at most one factor g_{00} , this ensures the overall cancelation of $a^{-2}N^{-2}$. The worst case is in calculating E_{abcd} , when the first contraction is with g^{ij} , because this introduces the term a^{-2} first. But then the Kulkarni-Nomizu product between resulting contracted term $g^{ij}g_{ij,00}$ and g will have only terms of the form $g^{ij}g_{ij,00}g_{kl}$ (the terms $g^{ij}g_{ij,00}g_{00}$ being canceled by taking the symmetries in (10)), and since $g_{kl} = a^2h_{kl}$, it cancels the factor a^{-2} . The terms of the form $g_{00,\bullet}g_{ij,\bullet}$ behave similarly.

It remains to see what happens with the terms obtained from the terms of the form $g_{ij,k0} = a(2\dot{a}\partial_k h_{ij} + a\partial_k \dot{h}_{ij})$. The term $a^2\partial_k \dot{h}_{ij}$ contains a^2 , so it doesn't pose problems. The only interesting term is $A_{ijk0} := a\dot{a}\partial_k h_{ij}$ (or other permutations of the i, j, k indices). A contraction with g^{ij} introduces a^{-2} , and we obtain a term of the form $a^{-1}A_{k0}$. The Kulkarni-Nomizu product of A_{k0} with g has the form

$$(34) \quad A_{0j}g_{ki} - A_{0i}g_{kj},$$

because $g_{0i} = g_{0j} = 0$. We know that a Riemannian metric in a space of dimension ≤ 3 can always be diagonalized [23], so if we take $h_{ij}(t)$ to be diagonal at the t in which we are interested, the above terms cancel one another.

This concludes the proof that all terms contained in R_{abcd} , E_{abcd} , and S_{abcd} are smooth. Hence, the metric (21) is quasi-regular. $\square$

This model can be connected with a cosmological model proposed by P. Fiziev and D. V. Shirkov [24], which consists in a dimensional reduction of spacetime (in topology and geometry) at the Big-Bang. When $a(t)$ vanishes, the space can be considered, in a way, to shrink at a point, so that one remains only with the time dimension. There are several properties of our model which seem to support that, at least, the universe behaves "as if" the dimensionality is reduced: the reduction of the rank of the metric, of the dimension of the cotangent space at such singular points, and by a certain independence of fields with the degenerate directions. In fact, if $N(t) = 0$ as well, it appears that the Universe emerged from a dimensionless point. Yet, the conditions in which such a dimensional reduction can be considered are not clear. Moreover, for our quasi-

regular singularities it seems to be, at least at this time, better to maintain four topological dimensions, because such a reduction may, in general, lose initial data.

3. CONCLUSION

The semi-regular singularities are well-behaved from many viewpoints, allowing us to perform the most important operations which are allowed by semi-Riemannian manifolds with regular metric tensor. When they are in addition quasi-regular, we can write a smooth expanded version of Einstein's equation (§0.3).

The quasi-regular singularities offer a nice surprise, since they have vanishing Weyl curvature C_{abcd} . It follows that any quasi-regular Big Bang singularity also satisfies the Weyl curvature hypothesis (§1).

As a main application, we studied in §2 a cosmological model which extends FLRW, by dropping the isotropy and homogeneity conditions. This generality is more realistic from physical viewpoint, since our Universe appears homogeneous and isotropic only at very large scales. This model contains as particular cases, in addition to FLRW, also the isotropic singularities.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author thanks P. Fiziev and D. V. Shirkov from Bogoliubov Laboratory of Theoretical Physics, JINR, Dubna, for helpful discussions and advice concerning the form and the content of this paper.

REFERENCES

- [1] R. Penrose. Singularities and time-asymmetry. In *General relativity: an Einstein centenary survey*, volume 1, pages 581–638, 1979.
- [2] G. 't Hooft and M. Veltman. One loop divergencies in the theory of gravitation. In *Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincaré: Section A, Physique théorique*, volume 20, pages 69–94. Institut Henri Poincaré, 1974.
- [3] M.H. Goroff and A. Sagnotti. The ultraviolet behavior of Einstein gravity. *Nuclear Physics B*, 266(3-4):709–736, 1986.
- [4] S. Carlip. Lectures in $(2+1)$ -dimensional gravity. *J.Korean Phys.Soc.*, 28:S447–S467, 1995. arXiv:gr-qc/9503024.
- [5] K.P. Tod. Quasi-local Mass and Cosmological Singularities. *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 4:1457, 1987.
- [6] K.P. Tod. Isotropic Singularities and the $\gamma = 2$ Equation of State. *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 7:L13–L16, 1990.
- [7] K.P. Tod. Isotropic Singularities and the Polytropic Equation of State. *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 8:L77, 1991.
- [8] K.P. Tod. Isotropic Singularities. *Rend. Sem. Mat. Univ. Politec. Torino*, 50:69–93, 1992.
- [9] K.P. Tod. Isotropic Cosmological Singularities. *The Conformal Structure of Space-Time*, pages 123–134, 2002.
- [10] K.P. Tod. Isotropic Cosmological Singularities: Other Matter Models. *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 20:521, 2003.
- [11] C.M. Claudel and K.P. Newman. The Cauchy problem for quasi-linear hyperbolic evolution problems with a singularity in the time. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 454(1972):1073, 1998.
- [12] K. Anguige and K.P. Tod. Isotropic Cosmological Singularities: 1. Polytropic Perfect Fluid Spacetimes. *Annals of Physics*, 276(2):257–293, 1999.
- [13] K. Anguige and K.P. Tod. Isotropic Cosmological Singularities 2: The Einstein-Vlasov System. *arXiv:gr-qc/9903009*, 1999.
- [14] C. Stoica. On Singular Semi-Riemannian Manifolds. *arXiv:math.DG/1105.0201*, May 2011.
- [15] C. Stoica. Warped Products of Singular Semi-Riemannian Manifolds. *arXiv:math.DG/1105.3404*, May 2011.
- [16] C. Stoica. Analytic Reissner-Nordstrom Singularity. *Phys. Scr.*, 85:055004, November 2012. arXiv:gr-qc/1111.4332.
- [17] C. Stoica. Einstein equation at singularities. *arXiv:gr-qc/1203.2140*, March 2012.
- [18] C. Stoica. Cartan's Structural Equations for Degenerate Metric. *arXiv:math.DG/1111.0646*, November 2011.

- [19] C. Stoica. Beyond the Friedmann-Lemaitre-Robertson-Walker Big Bang singularity. *arXiv:gr-qc/1203.1819*, March 2012.
- [20] J.A. Singer, I.M.; Thorpe. The curvature of 4-dimensional Einstein spaces. In *Global Analysis (Papers in Honor of K. Kodaira)*, pages 355–365. Univ. Tokyo Press, 1969.
- [21] Arthur L. Besse. *Einstein Manifolds, Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete (3) [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas (3)], vol. 10*. Berlin, New York: Springer-Verlag, 1987.
- [22] S. Gallot, D. Hullin, and J. Lafontaine. *Riemannian Geometry*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, New York, 3rd edition, 2004.
- [23] Wolfgang Rindler. *Relativity: Special, General, and Cosmological*. Oxford University Press, USA, May 2006.
- [24] P.P. Fiziev and D.V. Shirkov. The (2+1)-dim Axial Universes – Solutions to the Einstein Equations, Dimensional Reduction Points, and Klein–Fock–Gordon Waves. *J. Phys. A*, 45(055205):1–15, 2012. *arXiv:gr-qc/arXiv:1104.0903*.